



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,261	10/31/2003	Kazuo Okada	SHO-0056	9217
23353 7590 05/16/2008 RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC LION BUILDING 1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501 WASHINGTON, DC 20036				
EXAMINER				
PANDYA, SUNT				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3714				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/16/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/697,261

**Applicant(s)**

OKADA, KAZUO

**Examiner**

SUNIT PANDYA

**Art Unit**

3714

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/25/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

This action is in response to amendment filed by the applicant, wherein claims 1-4 are amended. Claims 1-7 are pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muir et al. (US Patent Publication 20050192090) and further in view of Ozaki et al. (US Patent 7,204,753).

Claims 1, 4: Muir et al. teaches of a gaming machine comprising a cabinet (figure 1), a decoration panel disposed on the front of the said cabinet (figure 1), a display device including a mask panel having a plurality of display windows provided through the display device mounted on the front of the cabinet and adjacent to the decoration panel (figure 1 and figure 8), a plurality of rotary reels operative to rotate about a common axis inside the cabinet (figure 8), wherein each reels has plurality of symbols disposed on them (0041) and the symbols are visible through the display window (figures 8). Muir et al. also teaches a light source disposed inside of the cabinet and behind the decoration panel, and the light source extending longitudinally along an

axis and including an elongated illuminating lamp and an elongated reflection plate positioned adjacent to the illuminating lamp, for illuminating the decorating panel (0061, 0063-0066). Muir et al. also teaches of atleast one light source unit disposed apart from the window and longitudinally contact the imaginary plane (figure 8), and the illuminating device is arranged so that the symbols are directly illuminated (0066).

Muir as taught above, teaches of illuminating symbols from light emitted from an illuminating lamp, however Muir et al. fails to teach of illuminating plurality of symbols by light emitted from the reflection plate. In an analogous art, Ozaki et al. teaches of a reflection plate disposed within the gaming machine, wherein the light emitted from the illuminating source and is reflected by the reflection plate to illuminate symbols (col. 19: 14-32). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Muir et al., to dispose a reflection plate to illuminate symbols by reflecting light emitted from the source, thus attracting player's attention and providing player entertainment (col. 2: 10-15).

Claim 2: Muir et al. teaches of gaming machine wherein transparent liquid crystal device is provided in front of the rotary reels (0048-0049).

Claim 3: Muir et al. discloses of a gaming machine comprising a cabinet (figure 1), multiple decoration panels disposed on the front of the said cabinet (figure 1, figures 3-4, element 20 is a button panel and the screen is a touch screen which can be utilized as additional decorative panel), a display window on the front of the cabinet (figure 8), a plurality of rotating reels operative to rotate about a common axis inside the cabinet (figures 1 & 8), wherein each reels has plurality of symbols disposed on them

(0041) and the symbols are visible through the display window (figure 8). Muir et al. also discloses multiple light sources for illuminating the decorating panel and a reflection unit/plate to guide light emitted from the light source to illuminate the symbols by reflecting the light source from the plate (figure 8, element 86 are multiple light sources). Muir et al. also discloses of a masked panel disposed between light sources, begin disposed apart from the display window and longitudinally contacting the imaginary plane (figure 8, 0066), the light sources are disposed such that the symbols are directly illuminated.

Muir as taught above, teaches of illuminating symbols from light emitted from an illuminating lamp, however Muir et al. fails to teach of illuminating plurality of symbols by light emitted from the reflection plate. In an analogous art, Ozaki et al. teaches of a reflection plate disposed within the gaming machine, wherein the light emitted from the illuminating source and is reflected by the reflection plate to illuminate symbols (col. 19: 14-32). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Muir et al., to dispose a reflection plate to illuminate symbols by reflecting light emitted from the source, thus attracting player's attention and providing player entertainment (col. 2: 10-15).

Claims 5, 6: Muir et al. discloses of locating the illuminating unit between the display and the reflective unit, wherein the light emitted from the light source illuminates the reels (figure 8).

Claim 7: Muir et al. discloses of one of the light source, which could be utilized to illuminate the light source (0066) and a reflective unit which is disclosed

between a light source and the display and thus the reflective unit does not block the light but enhances the light reflected off of its surface (figure 8)

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 3/5/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the amendments submitted by the applicant, examiner respectfully would bring the updated rejection to the applicant's attention, wherein the combination of Muir et al. and Ozaki et al. teaches the invention as claimed.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3714

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUNIT PANDYA whose telephone number is (571)272-2823. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto can be reached on 571-272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robert E Pezzuto/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714

SP